DISCLAIMER: In accordance with the *Community Safety and Policing Act* and the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the summary below has been de-identified to remove the personal information of individuals, including public complainants and persons who were the subject of the investigation.

DE-IDENTIFIED SUMMARY UNDER SECTION 167(2) OF THE CSPA

Original Police Service:

Date of Complaint: 01/09/2026

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

On November 20, 2025, the Complainants vehicle caught on fire while her son was driving it. [redacted] Police attended the call along with [redacted] Fire, the fire was deemed as non-suspicious. The Complainant alleges that police did not secure the vehicle, did not provide an occurrence and did not offer any follow-up to her.

The Complainant also alleges that Officers took her sons drivers licence and did not return it to him.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Section 19 - Neglect of Duty
Section 19 - Neglect of Duty

Decision and Reasons

(1) Neglect of Duty

Officers attended a radio call for a vehicle fire. Once on scene the [redacted] Fire advised officers that the vehicle started in the engine of the vehicle and ruled it as a mechanical. The Complainant alleges that officers failed to secure the vehicle, provide a occurrence number and did not follow up with her.

-The investigator reviewed the radio call, memo book notes, the [redacted] Police fire procedure, Body Won Camera footage and the fire report provided by the [redacted] Fire Service. It was ruled as non-suspicious, the fire was a result of a mechanical failure.

The investigator concluded that officers did not have to seize the vehicle for any further investigation. It was the responsibility of the Complainant to tow the vehicle. As per [redacted] Police 'Fire Procedure' an occurrence was not required, due to the fire being a non-criminal incident. Officers cleared the scene as they were no longer required, no follow-up with the Complainant was required. [redacted] Fire Service stayed on scene with the Complainant and assisted her with the towing process.

(2) Neglect of Duty

The Complainant alleged that Officers took her sons drivers licence and failed to return it to him.

-The investigator reviewed Officers Body Worn Cameras. It was observed that RO2 asked for the Complainant's son drivers licence. He could not locate his licence and believed that it may be in the vehicle that was on fire. He handed RO2 his Ontario Health card instead. Once the officer took down his information RO2 handed it back to him.

The investigator concluded that no officer was ever in possession of the drivers licence.